

**Remarks:**

Reconsideration of the application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8 - 14 are presently pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 15 has been canceled.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that item 5 of the above-identified Office Action indicated that claims 5, 6, 8, 12, 13 and 14 were allowed and that claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 1, herein, to include all of the limitations of former dependent claim 15, which was indicated as being allowable. Claim 15 has now been canceled. As such, in view of items 5 and 6 of the Office Action, it is believed that all claims of the present application are currently in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

More particularly, in item 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 4,054,753 to Kaul et al ("KAUL").

Applic. No. 09/897,279  
Response Dated February 9, 2007  
Responsive to Office Action of December 14, 2006

In item 4 of the Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **KAUL** in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,463,646 to Dillon et al ("**DILLON**").

However, former claim 15, indicated as being allowable in item 6 of the Office Action, depended directly from Applicant's former claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 1, herein, to include all the limitations of the allowable former claim 15. Claims 3, 9, 10 and 11, depend, ultimately, from the amended claim 1. As such, Applicant believes that the above rejections of former claims 1, 3, 9, 10 and 11 are now moot, and those claims are in condition for allowance.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 5 and 14. Claims 1, 5 and 14 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 5.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 - 14 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a

Applic. No. 09/897,279  
Response Dated February 9, 2007  
Responsive to Office Action of December 14, 2006

telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested, as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman  
Reg. No. 37,237

February 9, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101